

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and the following remarks.

At the outset, the Applicants wish to thank the examiner for the courtesy extended to their representative during a telephone interview conducted on November 17, 2008. During the interview, the examiner identified the changes he wanted Applicants to make to Figs. 1 and 4-11 for overcoming the objections thereto.

Figs. 1 and 4-11 have been amended in the manner requested by the examiner for overcoming the applied objections.

Claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 15, 16, and 19-21 have been amended, and claims 22 and 23 have been canceled. Support for the amendments is provided for example in Fig. 3 and the accompanying description in the specification. (References herein to the specification and drawings are for illustrative purposes only and are not intended to limit the scope of the invention to the referenced embodiments.) The amendments have been drafted to overcome the objections applied to claims 1-21. Claims 22 and 23 are canceled.

With regard to the objection applied to claim 21 for reciting "a data communication" in lines 10 and 26 (see Office Action page 3, fifth paragraph), the data communication recited in line 10 is that of a communication terminal apparatus and the data communication identified with respect to line 26 is that of a communication terminal accommodation apparatus. Thus, no indefiniteness exists in claim 21 with respect to this subject matter. The objections identified in the Office Action on page 3, sixth paragraph, and page 4, second and third paragraphs, are similarly deemed to be unwarranted. Withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-12 and 17-21 were rejected, under 35 USC §102(e), as being anticipated by Du et al. (US 6,556,576). Claims 13 and 14 were rejected, under 35 USC §103(a), as being unpatentable over Du in view of Kawano et al. (US 4,926,421). Claims 15 and 16 were rejected, under 35 USC §103(a), as being unpatentable over Du in view of Koo et al. (US 7,269,145). To the extent these rejections may be deemed applicable to the amended claims, the Applicants respectfully traverse as follows.

Claim 1 now defines an intermittent communication method that repeats data communication and a sleep period based on an intermittent communication period. In an exemplary, non-limiting, embodiment of the claimed subject matter illustrated in Applicants' Fig. 3, the sequence of a data communication period and a sleep period are repeated without any intervening periods.

By contrast to the Applicants' claimed subject matter, Du discloses a sub-network controller that receives a sleep request message identifying a proposed time for a sleep mode to begin and the proposed duration of the sleep mode (see Du col. 8, lines 13-17). In response to receiving the request, Du's sub-network controller communicates a confirmation message that confirms the start time for the sleep period (see col. 8, lines 17-22). Du does not disclose repeating a sequence of a data communication period and a sleep period without any intervening periods. Thus, if Du's method were to repeat sleep and data communication periods, as recited in claim 1, it would do so in the manner illustrated in Applicants' Fig. 2 in which request and confirmation communication periods intervene between successive periods of sleep and data communication.

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that Du does not anticipate the subject matter now defined by claim 1. Independent claims 2 and 19-21 now similarly recite the above-mentioned subject matter distinguishing method claim 1 from Du, although claims 19-21 do so with respect to an apparatus. Therefore, the rejections applied to claims 13-16 are deemed to be obviated and allowance of claims 1, 2, and 19-21 and all claims dependent therefrom is considered to be warranted.

In view of the above, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

If any issues remain which may best be resolved through a telephone communication, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned at the local Washington, D.C. telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/James Edward Ledbetter/

Date: November 18, 2008
JEL/DWW/att

James E. Ledbetter
Registration No. 28,732

Attorney Docket No. 009289-04191
Dickinson Wright PLLC
1875 Eye Street, NW, Suite 1200
Washington, DC 20006
Telephone: (202) 659-6966
Facsimile: (202) 659-1559